

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
	:	Examiner: L Nguyen
KAZUHIRO MATSUBAYASHI, et al.)	
	:	Group Art Unit: 2174
Application No.: 10/726,709)	
	:	
Filed: December 4, 2003)	
	:	
For: INFORMATION PROCESSING)	
APPARATUS, INFORMATION	:	
PROCESSING METHOD,)	
STORAGE MEDIUM, AND	:	
PROGRAM)	July 16, 2007

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated June 29, 2007, Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the Group I claims, namely Claims 1 to 23. The Restriction Requirement is, however, traversed.

Traversal is on the grounds that there would not be an undue burden on the Examiner in examining all of the claims in a single application. MPEP 808.02 requires that the Examiner show such an undue burden; but the Office Action fails to do so. Instead, the Office Action merely indicates that the Group I, II and III claims are separately

usable, but does not expressly state that the examination of the all the claims together in the same application would be an undue burden. Therefore, Applicants submit that there would not be an undue burden on the Examiner in examining all three groups of claims in a single application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200